

REMARKS

The Application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed March 6, 2007. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14, 21-23, and 25-29 were pending. Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14, 21-23 and 25-29 were rejected. Claims 1, 8, 21-22, and 25-26 have been amended to further define various features of Applicant's invention. New Claims 30 and 31 have been added. Claims 27-29 are hereby cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 7, 13, 15-20, and 24 were previously cancelled. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 21-23, 25, 26 and 29 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite and failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant amends Claim 21 to overcome this rejection as suggested by the Examiner and respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 21-23, 25, and 26 as amended.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-5, 8-10, 12, 14, 21 and 26-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior Art Figure 1 of the instant application (hereinafter "PA1") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,298,989 issued to Cheng-Kang Chu ("Chu '989").

Claims 6 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over PA1 and Chu as applied to Claims 1 and 8 above, and in further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,511,990 issued to Robert M. Hauss ("Hauss").

Claims 21-23 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,105,765 issued to Cheng Kang Chu ("Chu '765") in view of Chu '989.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the references cited by the Examiner must disclose all claimed limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974). Applicant respectfully argue that the proposed combinations, even if proper, do not render Applicant's amended claims obvious.

Claim 1 is Allowable over the proposed Chu-PA1 Combination.

Independent Claim 1 as amended recites, among other limitations:

at least six detachable joints formed in the packing support, each of the detachable joints comprising a joint between one of the top section joint portions of the top section and one of the bottom section joint portions of the bottom section.

Neither *Chu* '989 nor *PA1* teach or disclose **at least six detachable joints**. Further, neither *Hauss* nor *Chu* '765 teach or disclose **at least six detachable joints**.

For at least this reason, Independent Claim 1 is allowable over all of the cited references. Because Claims 2-6 and 30 depend from Independent Claim 1, they are likewise allowable.

Claim 8 is Allowable over the proposed Chu-PA1 Combination.

Independent Claim 8 as amended recites, among other limitations, “**at least eight detachable joints** formed in the container support.” Neither *Chu* '989 nor *PA1* teach or disclose at least eight detachable joints. Further, neither *Hauss* nor *Chu* '765 teach or disclose at least eight detachable joints.

For at least this reason, amended Claim 8 is allowable over all of the cited references. Because Claims 9-12 and 14 depend from independent Claim 8, they are likewise allowable.

Claim 21 is Allowable over the proposed Chu-Chu Combination.

Independent Claim 21 as amended recites, among other limitations:

a first upper packing support including:

an elongated C-shaped member configured to extend from a first side of the information handling system across a second side of the information handling system and to a third side of the information handling system opposite the first side; and

at least one arm extending substantially perpendicular from a portion of the C-shaped member to a fifth side of the information handling system;

Neither *Chu* '989 nor *PA1* teach or suggest these limitations. For example, neither *Chu* '989 nor *PA1* teach or suggest an upper packing support including an elongated C-shaped member, much less "at least one arm extending substantially perpendicular from a portion of the C-shaped member." Further, neither *Hauss* nor *Chu* '765 teach or suggest such elements.

For at least this reason, independent Claim 21 is allowable over the cited references. Because Claims 22-23 and 25-26 depend from independent Claim 21, they are likewise allowable.

New Claim 31 is Allowable.

New independent Claim 31 substantially incorporates the limitations of prior Claim 26. In the pending Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite and failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. No other basis for the rejection of Claim 26 was offered. Claim 31, which substantially incorporates the limitations of prior Claim 26, complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and is therefore allowable. Thus, Applicant requests allowance of new Claim 31.

CONCLUSION

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's careful review of the Application. Applicant believes that this case is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Applicant authorizes the Commissioner to charge \$450.00 for a Petition for Two Month Extension of Time Request to Deposit Account No. 50-2148 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Applicant believes there are no other fees due at this time. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees necessary or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2148 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicant's attorney at 512.322.2689.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTs L.L.P.
Attorney for Applicant

E. M. Grabski

Eric M. Grabski
Registration No. 51,749

Date: August 6, 2007

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

BAKER BOTTs L.L.P.

CUSTOMER ACCOUNT NO. **23640**
512.322.2689
512.322.8383 (fax)